



1979

Barrow

Stephen Conn

Suggested citation

Conn, Stephen. (1979). "Barrow." Stephen Conn Papers. Unpublished manuscript prepared under NIAAA Grant No. 1 H84 AA03183-01, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. Anchorage, AK: Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage.

Summary

This unpublished manuscript discusses police, judicial practices, and alcohol control in Barrow and the North Slope Borough of Alaska in the 1970s, and compares outpatient accident trends in Barrow and Bethel and their implications for protective custody laws. Community solutions to alcohol control in an area village, discussed under the pseudonym "Fishnet," are also described.

Additional information

A portion of this manuscript was the basis of a 1983 conference paper, "[An Analysis of Outpatient Accident Trends in Two Dry Eskimo Towns as a Measure of Alternative Police Responses to Drunken Behavior](#)" by Stephen Conn and Bonnie Boedeker.

BARROW

An Introduction

The town of Barrow, located about 530 air miles northwest of Fairbanks, is the northernmost permanent United States settlement. In addition to excellent tele-radio communications to other parts of Alaska, Barrow has a modern airport adjacent to town. Airlines servicing the Barrow area provide transportation links from the urban centers of Fairbanks and Anchorage to the North Slope region. It is through the airport at Barrow that smaller "bush" airlines provide further links to the suburban villages of Atkasook, Kaktovik, Nuiqsuit, Point Lay and Wainwright. Journeying from Barrow to the smaller suburban villages, when not by plane, is done primarily by snow machine. Occasional barge service in the summer months provide villages with supplies. Consequently, air transportation links provide the major year-round method of travel and source of supplies needed in Barrow and the surrounding villages. This includes nearly everything used there except subsistence items.

It is these air transportation links that enable Barrow to be the town which provides hospital services, court services, police services and, paradoxically, alcoholic beverages to the approximate 3,500 Inupiat Eskimo population of the region.

The North Slope Borough, administratively located in Barrow, covers a geographical area of approximately 88,000

square miles. North Slope villages are primarily situated along the coast of the Arctic Ocean up to 330 miles from Barrow, which is centrally located on the northern coastline of the Arctic Ocean. Some decisive factors in the environment are the ice masses of the Arctic Ocean which are never far away, a coastal climate, and the unbroken tundra, where the wind meets no obstacles. Ultimately, the efficiency of air transportation links are contingent on the Arctic weather.

The population of Barrow and surrounding villages varies considerably during the year. Although most of the people are no longer absolutely migratory, many families move to fishing and hunting camps in summer, others visit back and forth to surrounding villages, and some seek employment opportunities outside of their village and region.

Although state revenue sharing statistics show a stable population for Barrow and North Slope villages since 1970, various factors such as the birth rate and the return of the school age population indicate that the population of these communities has actually been growing at a moderate rate. This suspected growth will tend to slightly overstate increases in data presented in this report and understate decreases.

In recent years, the North Slope region has experienced major activity by oil companies involved in the construction of a trans-alaska pipeline to market oil from the region. The oil extraction business has been accompanied by stepped-up governmental activity, and a relatively high number of jobs (compared to other rural Alaskan communities) have

been available to citizens of the North Slope. The economic base that has been created in the region, however, is not entirely controlled by North Slope residents. The cost of living in the region is approximately twice that of Anchorage, and many residents are still dependent upon hunting and fishing for their food. In the post-construction period of the pipeline, some jobs are still available in the oil industry, but the most dependable jobs are provided by governmental activity in the form of the North Slope Borough, the regional and village native corporations.

Due to stepped-up industry in the region, there has been a parallel increase in the money available to the North Slope Borough, which has become the provider of many services in the area.

General police enforcement was transferred to the Borough in 1972, and in 1976, the Borough created the Department of Public Safety which currently provides professional police service to Barrow and seven villages in the region. Prior to 1976, Barrow was the only Borough community to have full-time police officers. Other areas outside of Barrow were primarily dependent on an Alaska State Trooper, who resided in Barrow, for police services. Although this Trooper was assisted by part-time village police in Point Hope and Wainwright, the transportation situation in the region made it impossible for him to ensure citizens in outlying areas of rapid, high quality police service. Normally, the Trooper would not get to the scene of even a serious police problems in less than two days.

The problem of alcohol control, once dealt with by a village council/social consensus system, has become the major concern of police in the Barrow region.

Style and Approach As Determinates In Crime Statistics and Alcohol Control

The author has been able to observe police and judicial practices in Barrow over a period from 1972-1978. A number of factors influence the relative numbers of persons picked up by police and the severity of their charges, other than an aggregate change in drinking practices or in criminal activity.

Police Department Composition

The municipal police department in the early 1970's was a six man force, composed primarily of untrained natives. Most officers knew the persons they encountered on the street. Currently, the Borough police have ten to twelve officers with one or two native employees in Barrow. They are strangers to many residents. Trooper and town arrest date reflects levels of police resources and levels of police response to at least as significant degree as it does actual occurrences. Thus, careful comparisons between arrest rates when active use of protective custody was the established policy of the North Slope Borough Police in 1977 with a previous (1976) year when the same police system was funded and established has been found to be less significant than the eight-fold increase of arrests of all types in these

than the eight-fold increase of arrests of all types in these years when compared with earlier periods when a single trooper, and small municipal police force operated on the North Slope. (Table 1)

In municipal police activity observed by the author in 1972-1973, the following characteristics appeared:

Drunks who were not engaged in rowdy activity were often ignored or asked to go home. Some persons who showed they were about to fight were arrested for assault even before they had traded blows. These were persons who had established reputations as "crazy" when drunk. Other persons who were drunk and rowdy were arrested and charged with drunk in public and disorderly conduct, and not for more serious crimes. Provision was allowed in drunk in public and disorderly conduct offenses committed in Barrow in 1971-1972 for dismissal of the charge and waiver of a court appearance after the defendant had sobered up.

Serious offenses were further mitigated by the Eskimo magistrate who heard misdemeanor cases. In years when she was not unduly influenced by the resident state trooper, she suspended sentences meted out for alcohol-related cases and for other crimes.

When a burglary was committed by a person who was intoxicated, she tended to suspend the sentence. Also, when a bootlegger was known to be a good man and a good provider, she would dismiss the charge or suspend the sentence, noting that juries in Barrow had done the same thing.

In short, the characteristics of policing and judging in the early period of statehood were a mix of village approaches to justice and state law approaches.

Conduct was measured not only against the letter of the law, but also against the personal reputation of the offender prior to the incident. Personal knowledge of the offender played a leading role in the decision of when to charge and how severely to charge. It was also as significant as the letter of the law in the magistrate's courtroom.

In the late 1970's, not only was the police system professionalized, but intoxicated persons were dealt with more uniformly. The net result was more serious charges and more confinement of persons who were intoxicated, whether or not these persons had reputations for being violent when drunk. Fewer warnings were given. More persons were processed through the police process.

Due Process

Now, as in previous years, large numbers of Eskimo persons are being picked up for public intoxication and for possession of liquor in "dry" Barrow. However, unlike the period from 1964-1970, appearance before a magistrate does not follow that arrest. In the period 1964-1970, a Barrow ordinance for transporting liquor in an open container in public, and the state drunk in public law were used as a basis for many arrests. In the period 1976-1979, protective

custody has been employed for these same factual occurrences.

The decriminalization of drunk in public and the subsequent finding by the Alaska Supreme Court in the Peters/Case that drunk on a public highway should be repealed as a matter of legislative intent meant that a regular opportunity to request counsel and to have a lay or professional judge test the basis of the pick-up has been denied to persons who are picked up on protective custody. Further, use of the open bottle ordinance ended when the superior court in Fairbanks complained to the police that the court docket was loaded with such cases (Corbett Interview, 1979).

An argument could be made that at least some of the persons taken into protective custody would plead not guilty and request counsel if that opportunity were provided.

An analysis of court records of the Eskimo magistrate in Barrow from 1964-1970 does not demonstrate this to be the case. Nearly all Eskimo defendants pleaded guilty when they appeared on either transportation of liquor charges or as defendants in drunk in public cases (Hippler and Conn, 1973).

One might argue, however, that in the nearly ten years since the period in which these figures were generated, many defendants had become socialized to the American legal process sufficiently to challenge the authority of police and to plead not guilty.

Then, as now, Barrow has no resident public defender. Therefore, to the extent that direct access to counsel

figures in this decision to plead guilty, there has been no change in the Barrow situation.

So also does Barrow have in residence an Eskimo magistrate, a person with deep social ties in the community. To the extent that defendants trust this local resident sufficiently to plead guilty with an expectation that no fine or jail term will be levied, that expectation might well carry over to the second decade.

A strong argument against court appearances is that re-criminalization of drunk in public would mean fines and jail terms in addition to the overnight lockup. An analysis of disposition for drunk in public and for other offenses from 1964-1970 suggests that the Eskimo magistrate in some years, but not others, offset the universal guilty pleas by suspending many sentences for drunk in public, and for other crimes. However, she did not do this consistently. At times she was subjected to pressure by municipal police or troopers to levy fines and jail sentences in nearly all cases without suspending them.

Although consideration of the due process option is necessarily speculative, two conclusions might be suggested from this review of drunken behavior cases and liquor possession cases in Barrow in an earlier decade when court appearances were required:

1. The availability of professional judges or attorneys has not changed. To the extent that this affected rates of guilty pleas, one could expect no significant change in

pleas, if protective custody included a court appearance and opportunity for defendants to assert rights. However, there are many signs that Eskimo people are more inclined to assert rights than in the previous decade. In the previous decade only bootleggers and their retained counsel pled not guilty. Eskimo persons on the North Slope have an improved understanding of the Alaskan legal process.

2. Yet, even if the police pick-up and its basis were subjected to judicial scrutiny, the price of this review might be fines and jail sentences in addition to the sobering up period in the Barrow jail.

The foregoing analysis of the dynamics of law and social control as each pertains to alcohol use and control suggests at least three elements critical to the relationship between local law, state and national law in Eskimo villages:

1. First, that council justice and even village police justice operated within the context of a fragile, but resilient, social consensus regarding alcohol possession and use in the villages. Village councils and police did not define or impose that consensus. The activities of each flowed from this consensus and from the employment of other social control devices that were not dependant upon the council or upon village police activity. Chief among these was the use of a classic technique of avoidance, refusing to blame a sober person for the consequences of his drunken behavior.

To the extent that persons have refrained from bringing large quantities of liquor into the village, from sharing it

with persons who are known to be violent when drunk or from selling liquor in villages, these proscriptions have been non-institutionalized social proscriptions, only sporadically reinforced by village council, police, or problem board activity.

This underlying social consensus is still evident in clusters of villages located in the Bethel region, however, these villages have had relatively less improvement in wage earning opportunities at home, a stronger identity as hunters, transportation and communication, and have relatively stronger ties to the Moravian Church.

2. Second, police intervention has been an element of social control for nearly fifty years. Yet that police intervention was limited to a small number of recalcitrant individuals, usually persons whose ties with the community were not such as to make "natural" their response to the community consensus. The drunk-sober dicotomy also allowed local police to manhandle fellow-Eskimos without fear of personal retribution and with limited community support since the sober fellow Eskimo was not touched.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find strong community support for additional police intervention in alcohol-related problems in villages and towns among Eskimo residents. As a limited technique for control over and above controls flowing from the social consensus, police intervention has worked.

Left unclear, however, is the level of police intervention

required in village or town to replace the missing social consensus regarding alcohol use and alcohol-related behavior. The Barrow experiment suggests that the level of police intervention required would be truly massive and all-pervasive. To curb drinking behavior with police appears, finally, to create "total institutions" (Goffman,) of towns and villages with police as guards of the social scene.

Kim Moeller, Director of the North Slope Borough Department of Public Safety, published a report in January, 1979 entitled: "Alcohol Abuse and the Police in Rural Alaska". The monograph is an analysis of the detention program that has been employed in Barrow since 1976 under the auspices of the protective custody laws. Individuals found incapacitated by alcohol in public places are detained up to eight hours in the Barrow jail facility. Moeller cites arrest records that indicate a reduction in such crimes as vandalism, burglary, aggravated assault, larceny, disorderly conduct, assault and battery and malicious mischief since the introduction of the program in 1976. Other positive effects reportedly have occurred in the drop of suicides, fire and other accidental deaths.

However, Moeller has experienced some unexpected consequences of the protective custody policy. Every month of 1979 has evidenced a 35-40% increase in protective custody jailings over the same month in 1978 (Moeller Interview, 1979). Upon publication of the report in Barrow, there was a major public outcry. Many residents did not realize the number of individuals being jailed. In Barrow and surrounding villages, there is only a limited recognition of the outward social

implications of exclusive dependency upon this external source of control for dealing with alcohol use and drunken comportment.

At state policy levels, also, there seems to be only limited appreciation of the fact that decriminalization of alcohol related behavior without creation and funding of other remedies, means that activities in this realm become exclusively police activities. Lawyers and courts are removed from the process, but police (and jails) are not. Unlike larger cities, where police concentrate their control on native populations who frequent downtown "combat zones", police activity in villages and towns tends to demarcate the entire city as a combat zone to be heavily policed.

In small villages, active policemen can engage more than half of the entire adult population. Police have not typically played such a pervasive role in American legal process in Alaska or elsewhere. However, this prospective role for police in villages and cities in Alaska has its present-day counterpart in Frobisher Bay, a 3,000 person town in the Northwest territories, where nearly thirty Royal Canadian Mounted Police patrol and apprehend citizens.

As a matter of public policy, the expanded role of police in villages and towns should be made a central topic for debate at village, town and state levels.

3. The town has been historically the single reliable source of both wage earning opportunities and of alcohol, from both the legal and illegal sources. Thus, a key element

in village social control has been the town's position on liquor, as reflected in its ordinances and in its police and court practices.

The town's posture is still significant. But the impact that the town has upon specific villages now varies according to a more complicated set of factors:

A. Some villages, but not all villages, have improved wage earning opportunities at home. This means that villagers do not have to migrate to town to earn money.

B. Where wage earning opportunities have developed within the villages, coupled with air and telephone communication to the town and the larger cities beyond, village residents have a relatively new option. They can order liquor from cities or charter to other sources of liquor in their home region. They have, in short, new opportunities to drink at home if they choose not to go to the town and drink.

C. Town practices which responded to a predictable set of events--that villagers would migrate to town to obtain jobs and that some of these people would drink to excess, given available liquor at reasonable cost--must now respond to another, less predictable set of events.

Villagers may or may not seek wage opportunities and liquor in the town. This depends entirely upon opportunities in the villages, links to the cities, and the posture of the town regarding public drinking.

In the past, the town had a monopoly on liquor control. If it could curb liquor use in town, it would follow that

liquor use in the villages would be curbed sufficiently to allow a combination of limited police and council activity along with the social consenses of the village to contain drunken behavior in the village.

At present, town practice (both police and prosecutorial) has another implication. While police and prosecutors can make drinking in town expensive and costly, it cannot curb liquor use in all villages as predictably.

For villages that have wage earning opportunities, a weakened social consensus, and transportation/communication links to the outer world, the town may only serve to discourage drinkers from coming to town to drink.

The result of this would be to export what had previously been regarded as "town problems" to the villages for resolution or non-resolution there.

Each regional town has developed a panoply of resources (albeit understaffed and underfunded) to deal with those persons who are deviant when they drink to excess. Thus, towns have hospitals, alcohol or mental health clinics, police, courts and holding facilities for intoxicated persons.

As the Angell study (1978) demonstrates, few Alaska villages have even rudimentary Western legal or social service resources to deal with that minority of persons who endanger themselves or others when drinking.

The results of town policy, then, may be to discourage drinkers from drinking in town and to shift back onto village resources, governmental and social, drinking problems.

For legal policy makers in towns, then, their task is even more complicated. Policies of control must be devised which employ police and jail along with other resources to contain drinking sufficiently to satisfy town residents, native and non-native. At the same time, these techniques must not be so successful as to drive drinkers back to their own villages where the magnitude of drinking activities is far greater in terms of the capacity of local law to act to contain them.

Early Intervention Of Police And Protective Custody

Dennis Kelso, Alaska sociologist and one authority on alcohol in the state, praises the North Slope Borough police approach on several counts (Kelso, 1979). He notes the absence of much recidivism among persons taken into custody and suggests that police intervention during a drinking phase breaks that pattern of conduct at a crucial point in time so that problems associated with binge drinking do not arise.

He argues that this form of legal process, custodial incarceration without further judicial review well reflects what Eskimos desire from the legal process. The sober person is not presented with his conduct in court and asked to make amends for his drinking behavior. The sober person and the drunken person are allowed to remain separate in the eyes of the offender as well as in the eyes of family and community.

To the argument that maintenance of this form of external control will not allow internal controls to develop, Kelso, proceeding from a firm grounding in sociological theory, argues that their internal controls notion is a kind of middle class illusion. He notes that other external controls, arising from organized communities, job and family are the substitutes for police in most places. Eskimo towns are not yet communities which can provide these substitutes; they differ from villages in their size, history and capacity to provide roles which satisfy goals of residents and at the same time provide checks on behavior.

Kelso's argument is an important one. There is much evidence to support many portions of it discovered by this investigation.

It is true, for example, that to the extent that rural people have come to depend upon legal activity useful to them, that activity focuses upon the work of police. The first demand of several conferences held on bush justice has been for improved police service. Improved police service was one of the first social needs responded to by the North Slope Borough when its treasury was filled by oil revenues.

In 1977, before complete organization of the police force and during a year of wet status in Barrow, criminal law problems heightened in both Barrow and outlying villages.

Prosecutorial services to process arrests on misdemeanors made by the Borough police force was extremely limited. A

review of the court docket books finds many cases dismissed for lack of prosecution within 120 days. While some of these cases may reflect screening of arrests by prosecutors, the high rate of non-prosecution appears to reflect indifference by the prosecutor's office in Fairbanks. Further, a dispute over conduct by several police, led to a political breach between the North Slope and the state law enforcement establishment. The Alaska State Troopers did not support regionalization of the police effort and pulled its single trooper out of Barrow.

In sum, had the North Slope Police not begun to focus upon protective custody as a kind of police diversion, there would have been no appearance of a functioning justice system because of a failure of prosecutorial and judicial support for increased police work by regional officers.

Investigation for this grant focused on a key North Slope Village which we will call Fishnet. Further support for the Kelso position is evident in villages such as Fishnet and Fishnet 2. In both places, records and interviews indicate that there was a withdrawal of council intervention into alcohol related problems. In Fishnet, the council joined the school board, teachers and principals in demanding intervention by either the North Slope Police (by stationing a man in the village) or intervention by the state law enforcement establishment for the increased criminal law problems they were experiencing in 1977. In Fishnet 2, alcohol related problems were delegated to village policemen.

These policemen would restrain drunken persons and place them in a small village-constructed cell. When persons were violent, they would be restrained by a straight jacket.

The reasons for this change in village council attitude in these places are several. Councils have changed their composition in some places from persons familiar and comfortable with early intervention into drinking problems to those who are inclined to expect substitution for this activity by state legal authorities. In the case of Fishnet, the community was led to expect paid police officers in their village. They remained uncertain as to the amount of control the council would have over these officers. Non-natives (e.g., the Fishnet principal and teachers) were ignorant of the past record of council involvement and expected traditional American legal intervention by state police, prosecutors and judges.

The magnitude of problems encountered in these villages, both in the midst of significant building programs, was new to the villages and their local justice systems. Local residents had sufficient cash to charter airplanes to liquor outlets in the region, returning with cases of liquor that gave rise to many problems at the same time. Strangers, both non-Natives and Natives from other places, persons who lacked sufficient ties to the village to have any allegiance to a council system that was rooted fundamentally in individual desire to achieve a consensus with villagers on matters of conduct, were independent of council action and were present

in sufficient numbers to demonstrate a similar disdain for council edicts, especially edicts which were contrary to state law.

Small numbers of young adult males were able to set a tone of conduct to be followed by young people. The result in Fishnet was instances of vandalism to school and teacher property, graffiti on the school water tank and walls of the village store. All instances were viewed with shock by Natives and non-Native residents who had lived in Fishnet in years earlier.

The kind of activity engaged by the North Slope Borough police was not without precedent in the experience of Barrow people. In the early 1970's during a dry epoch, magistrate figures suggest that nearly every person between 18 and 22 were arrested for minor crimes, particularly drunk in public. The usual procedure was for the magistrate to let these offenders off after a night in jail. In 1973, this procedure was supplemented by an administrative arrangement, endorsed by then attorney general, John Havelock, to arrest and hold drunken persons without requiring a court appearance.

Eskimo law ways, while intolerant of direct intervention to other person's conduct except by a careful process of indirection, best typified by council attempts to draw deviants back into the fold of the village's social contract with explanations of the village law, seems to have allowed for an exception when the person was intoxicated.

Intoxicated persons could be dealt with more directly and constrained. The argument for this exception seems to be that the intoxicated person and the sober person were different people. The sober person could not be blamed for his acts while intoxicated; but neither could the person who was intoxicated blame others for dealing with him differently when he was drunk.

In short, a special kind of license to act antisocially was afforded both the drunken person and the person who constrained the behavior.

This attitude was buttressed by fear of persons who acted as police. While local residents who became village police could, in many cases, be harrassed by their peers or encouraged to drink so as to slip out of the police role, outside police (non-Native police) were taken more seriously.

Kelso's argument that the town lacked the natural social restraints of the village for native people, both residents and visitors from other villages, has merit. The towns were fundamentally service centers established in the main for the purposes of outside agency purposes, although both Bethel and Barrow have a long history of inhabitation by native people. They were vastly larger than villages. The likelihood that ongoing social relationships would put a constraint on behavior was not as valid as in smaller villages.

Some persons clearly viewed towns as a place to "let off steam" among strangers. Some small villages, notably recognized this by sending delegations of villagers into

town to watch one another (Marquez Interview, 1978).

The argument that persons are governed by external controls in each setting and that police control is perhaps a transitional substitute for villagers who come to town to stay or to visit has some severe policy implications if accepted. A product of such a policy will be some continuing demonstration that justice meted out by the Western law system will be racially biased since non-Natives are rarely picked up by police.

There have already been some outcry by urban Natives against judicial sentencing patterns which disclose that non-violent white collar crimes tend to be punished with probation for white offenders and short jail terms for natives (Judicial Council Study, 1979).

The experience of justice for the young population, more sophisticated in such matters as asserting legal rights and knowledgeable about theoretical rights of due process, tends to confirm what they might perceive as a distinct racial bias in the use of law.

The legal education derived from contact with police in these two towns, the primary education in law for many villagers and town people, is that custodial arrests result in summary conviction.

Those who argued for modification of the protective custody provision that changed the nature of police activity when being drunk was decriminalized suggested that the only conceivable response, given legal resources as well as

treatment services, was overt and exclusive police intervention with the jail used as a treatment facility when alternatives were not available.

Their argument is especially strong and accurate in small villages throughout the state that lack resident or regular contact with judicial officers or attorneys as well as the funds to construct and maintain treatment or sleep-off centers. The jail is the only place to secure a drunken person; the policeman is the only person especially justified to take him there or anywhere else without resulting social repercussions.

While this argument may stand for villages, towns stand on a different footing in the allocation of state resources. The state appears to be committed to providing judicial services as well as representation and physical sites for trials and towns.

Barrow's legal posture has been defined in part because of the failure of the state to fulfill this commitment. If the state legal establishment feels ill at ease with police activity that acts independently of the rest of the legal process it has not made sufficient steps to allow an alternative policy to be developed in Barrow.

The argument that internal controls are an illusion has a number of dangerous implications when used to sustain the historical role of alcohol control laws and their agents; the treatment of native populations as persons who should not and cannot drink.

We feel safe in concluding that Natives as well as non-Natives believe that Native people have a special problem with alcohol. Legal authorities in Alaska from the time of the Russian Trading Company have made law enforcement a reflection of that belief.

Certainly the belief is confirmed by daily experience with the law in Eskimo towns. What damage this does to persons who attempt to cast alcohol problems within a treatment modality cannot be measured. Generations of native families have been stigmatized, while drinking pathology among whites is ignored. Law-ways may reinforce the belief, apparently shared by Natives and non-Natives, that Natives have a special problem with liquor. Further, it reinforces liquor use as a social mask in villages and towns which allows some native persons to act in ways entirely inappropriate to sober persons with an expectation that police will intervene.

However, drinking in a frontier context or in a context where one's social role is put into question, may be so environmentally determined that a sense that one has an ultimate choice about drinking may be illusive and even tautological.

Support for this position seems to flow from two findings. First, that many native persons end their drinking days when they reach middle age and have family responsibilities. Second, that notable success in ending drinking abuse has

been accomplished by fundamentalist religious sects. In both instances, it can be argued that overriding group and institutional restraints made ongoing police contact unnecessary.

Yet, there are other more negative conclusions that can be drawn from this picture of racially exclusive police activity as it pertains to persons who are not increasingly family centered or drawn to fundamentalist sects.

If, as McAndrews and Edgerton (1969) and their followers suggest, drinking behavior is learned behavior, how does the perpetuation of police activity and village or towns official prohibition on purchase, sale and sometimes use of alcohol contribute to the social context of drinking? Does continuing perpetuation of alcohol as contraband have any influence on drinking behavior?

Advocates of the police and legal practices described in this study would argue with strong empirical grounding that their position must be one of dealing with the short term effects of drinking as it effects criminal activity, suicides, accidents and other social maladies in regions where public and social resources are scant. Police must cast a large net around problem and non-problem drinkers in order to compensate for the absence of treatment programs, medical services at the village and town level and, even, police protection against the antisocial acts of a minority of persons who drink.

A further argument in support of the present policy in

the bush is that it may indeed have a positive impact on drinking behavior. Thus, policy aimed at public drinking in groups may drive members from this group and, thus, from the social setting in which violence and accidents occur. Native drinking is, in the main, social drinking and not solitary drinking. Persons may allow their desire to avoid police contact to shape their drinking behavior.

Although the debate over short versus long term effects and the meaning of short term effects and long term effects of these legal practices may be unresolvable, there is another element of the social experience of Eskimos which must be taken into account in weighing the balance between emphasis on legal control and other more illusive approaches.

The core of this emerging reality is that rural Alaska is increasingly less distant from urban Alaska where police are not capable of intervening in all drinking problems and less inclined to label criminal law violations as matters of protective custody. Urban Alaska and its liquor policy of *laisse faire* is having an increasing impact on rural Alaska. Travel to and from villages and towns is a more frequent occurrence, Transportation and communication of food and materials has its secondary effect in ready transportation of liquor to consumers and to bootleggers.

Advocates of the approaches presently employed in villages and towns can argue that these external restraints on anti-social drinking allow other things to happen in villages and towns which could, in turn, have a positive

impact on drinking behavior. Towns become more livable for both natives and non-natives. Programs and projects aimed at broadening the job market and upgrading the social and economic future of town and village people are more easily organized and implemented in a climate of control. Recreational alternatives and educational alternatives are allowed to be developed. Even treatment programs are allowed to proceed in environments not characterized by alcohol use in what some term epidemic proportions.

Carolyn Peters, author of a school curriculum on Alcohol education employed in many rural areas, herself an alcoholic and wife of an alcoholic Athabascan Indian, suggested that the single way that her husband could control his drinking was to leave his Athabascan village and move to a Southern Alaskan city.

Quite obviously, departure from towns and villages as a solution to pathological drinking is not desired, nor even contemplated, by most native people.

Several questions then emerge. For how long can agents of law in rural Alaska pursue practices that are only partially in synchronizatrion with legal policies in regions outside the bush where rural people visit, live and see opportunities not available in the bush. Changes in the social and economic life of rural Alaska, including the connections between that social and economic life and urban Alaska, may have the effect of drawing into that region other kinds of legal development not at all compatible with the continued employment of prohibitory approaches. The reaction of the predominately

urban Alaska legislature and even some bush legislators to the Hammond administration's proposals for increased control over alcohol seem indicative of the intolerance of legislatures of various political persuasions for seemingly outdated approaches to alcohol control. Already urban judges who have heard cases in rural Alaska appear to have less concern for such matters as bootlegging or the difficulties of making a case for bootlegging.

Second, rural people do not live in rural Alaska alone. They travel to urban centers. What impact will emerge from a wide disparity between local law and state law.

Third, what impact will this posture of Alaska law have on the legal literacy of the population as problems emerge which require appreciation and expectation of the legal process as a place where rights are asserted and laws are tested? Alaska Natives have a wide variety of potential legal problems in their dealings with outsiders, federal government, state government and regional corporations established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

Even if one places the debate over the impact of alcohol control law aside, one must reflect on the fact that laws prohibiting alcohol consumption and police intervention when one drinks are the dominant legal experience, followed closely by engagement with the state over fishing and hunting rights.

We suggest that the picture of the law as a racially stigmatizing agent in its dealing with alcohol is both positive and negative. As a positive force it attends to, but confirms a pattern of conduct of long duration, one not likely to be changed by legal change only or legislative characterization of drinking as non-criminal. It is negative in its overriding effect on the legal socialization of Native peoples. Unless Native people have important countervailing experience with law as a social instrument to contest important rights, it would appear that even as the legal process makes itself more apparent in ways other than through police activity, these new legal opportunities may be shunned, ignored and avoided.

Only when natives disavow a portrait of themselves as persons who have special problems with liquor will the law be able to take a new direction in rural Alaska. It is unlikely that the law will be able to undo the work it has done in confirming this stereotype throughout the history of native and white contact.

In the end, alcohol control laws must be used as a policy choice that is available when other choices are not. Alcohol control laws in village Alaska and their use must be understood as something more than continued employment of laws fraught with class-bias and attempts to impose white moral edicts on native people. Those directly involved in town and village living must respond to a situation and a relationship between alcohol and Natives that is long lived.

By doing this, law agents do indeed combat the sins of the fathers by repeating them.

An Examination Of
The Local Option Elections
In The Barrow Region

Although state law does not allow a local option for possession of liquor to be outlawed, local communities have the option of outlawing the sale of alcohol in their community. Alaska Statute 04.10.430(a) authorizes a local option election for the sale of intoxicating liquors when 35 percent of the total number of voters in the last general municipal election petitions the city council to do so.

The sale of intoxicating liquors in Barrow was legalized, for the first time in its history, on December 15, 1972. Since that time, several local option elections have altered Barrow's status as a "wet" or "dry" town. The City of Barrow operates the Ukpeagvik Community Liquor Store during each wet year. Other than an hotel bar that usually caters to non-native customers, the community liquor store is the only local source of legal alcohol during wet periods.

Ukpeagvik Community Liquor Store

This store's first full year of operation, in 1973, generated a net income of approximately \$75,000. Before its most recent closure in December, 1977, the store generated an annual net income of approximately \$200,000.00. Although

the population of the communities in the North Slope Region remained relatively stable, liquor sales doubled.

Net Income of Ukpeagvik Community Liquor Store

(Averaged from Fiscal Year Income) 1973

<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978-79</u>
\$74,722	\$81,810	\$160,690	Dry	\$209,630	Dry

(From Barrow City Audits, 1973 through 1977)

Complex factors affect the outcome of the almost yearly vote on the proposition "for the sale of intoxicating liquors" in the North Slope region. Of particular significance is the intensity of emotions associated with alcohol related crimes and accidents.

The Director of the North Slope Police, Kim Moeller, expressed public sentiment regarding the wet policy in a letter he wrote to Governor Hammond near the latter part of 1975. He reported tragic deaths due to alcohol, such as a mother who had accidentally smothered her infant while drunk, and urged Governor Hammond to assist in the creation and passage of alcohol control legislation applicable to rural Alaska. In the local option election of October, 1975, Barrow once again became a dry town - by a 3 vote margin.

However, during the dry year, 1976, Barrow was still plagued by alcohol-related accidents and crimes. In the opinion of Barrows's Magistrate, Charlotte Brower, the flow of alcohol seems to be unchecked during a dry period (Brower Interview, 1978). Magistrate Brower reflected a

frustration felt by many in Barrow, that a dry year is a deterrent to drinking for some, but for most, it only means higher priced alcohol (Moeller Interview, 1978; Inupiat Community Social Services Interview, 1978).

At the end of 1976, Barrow's first dry year since 1972, the town's voters made the sale of intoxicating liquors legal by a 116 vote margin.

However, by the end of 1977, sentiment against the wet local option was again mounting in Barrow.

The election in favor of the dry local option in Barrow was particularly impacted by two events occurring in 1977:

1) Representatives of the satellite village of Fishnet made a special presentation to the Barrow city council urging them to close the liquor in an attempt to preserve the peacefulness of the village. Alcohol related crime had escalated considerably in this village during 1977. There was not a professional police officer stationed in the village at this time. Fishnet was making a call for action from Barrow and the North Slope Borough Department of Public Safety to curb the increasing alcohol abuse that resulted in harassment and harm to temporary and permanent residents in the village. Also, problems inherent in the tendency of alcohol abusers to be carrying and using firearms were expressed (Videotape of Fishnet Village Council Meeting, 1977).

Magistrate Brower strongly contends that Barrow's dry status reduces the alcohol problems in North Slope Villages,

although she is less optimistic about the positive effects of the law on Barrow residents (Brower Interview, 1978). In a review of sentences the magistrate imposed on convicted bootleggers through August, 1978, the harshest sentence was meted out to a convicted bootlegger operating in a small satellite village (See Table). 2) The second circumstance impacting the local option election was a double homicide of two non-native visitors to Barrow in August, 1977.

In October, 1977, Barrow voters supported a dry local option; this time by a 86 vote margin. This evidenced the highest voter support for the dry local option in Barrow in the period of the 70's.

The contention that a dry local option in Barrow has a greater impact on satellite villages than it does in Barrow follows the logic of the Eskimo "town" being the buffer between the traditional Eskimo culture and the western world. Perhaps it reflects the acceptance of the Barrow individuals that the problems of acculturation be concentrated in towns, if it better ensures the protection of remote villages and Eskimo culture.

An Analysis Of Outpatient Accident Trends
In Barrow and Bethel
Their Implications for Protective Custody Laws

The residents of Barrow and Bethel, in addition to the villages surrounding them, are treated for outpatient accidents

by the Native Health Service hospitals located within each town. A record is made of the cause and place of injury when individuals are treated for outpatient accidents, which consist of those accidents not requiring hospitalization. A small percentage of non-native individuals are treated by the same facilities in areas such as Barrow where no other medical facilities exist. The statewide data included in Table 1 represents both the urban native population, such as Anchorage, and the rural native population, such as Barrow and Bethel. It is possible to compare statewide outpatient data to the same data from individual regions.

Differences between the number of occurrences, causation, and place of outpatient alcohol-related accidents are apparent in comparing the Barrow region to the Bethel region and the state as a whole. Although a small portion of the differences might be attributed to idiosyncracies in recording practices between regions, certain trends in these data suggest that specifics of alcohol control mechanisms make an impact on how and where alcohol-related accidents occur in rural regions.

The cause of injury labeled: "Injury Purposefully Inflicted by Another" is of particular interest to us because it may indicate a violation of criminal law. Also, injury purposefully inflicted by another accounted for a substantial percentage of alcohol-related accidents in both the Barrow region (40%) and the Bethel region (41%) compared to other

causes including motor vehicle, environmental factors, accidental falls and poisoning (Table 3).

We analyzed "Inside the Home" as a place of injury because of the magnitude of alcohol-related accidents that occur inside the home (Table 2), and because the home as a place of alcohol related accidents has an implication on the usefulness of protective custody laws in the State of Alaska which limit the police to public intervention of drunken comportment.

In the Barrow region, 42% of the alcohol related accidents occur inside the home. This is 14% higher than the statewide ratio of all alcohol related accidents that occur inside the home (Table 2). It is particularly higher than other places that set the scene for alcohol-related accidents including outside the home, highway and street, recreation and public building (Table 4).

Furthermore, outpatient data indicate that the home is frequently a setting for interpersonal violence, especially in Barrow. Within the statewide native population, 32% of all accidents purposefully inflicted by another occur inside the home. In Barrow region, 56% of all outpatient accidents recorded as injury purposefully inflicted by another occur inside the home (Table 2). This may indicate that the Barrow region has a 24% higher ratio of interpersonal violence within the home than the statewide native population.

Alcohol abuse plays a major role in the occurrence of

interpersonal violence inside the home. The percentage of all accidents purposefully inflicted by another, alcohol related, that occur inside the home is 21% higher in the Barrow region than the same ratio in the state as a whole (Table 2).

Several factors should be considered as making the home a setting for alcohol related accidents in the Barrow region. In the period covered by the preceding data, the local option in the town of Barrow prohibited the sale of alcoholic beverages, and no public drinking establishments existed.

In addition to the legally dry status of Barrow, the approach to alcohol control by town police may determine where drinking and violence occur. Liquor that is illegally purchased in the town of Barrow, or purchased legally from Fairbanks is received in bottles and can be safely consumed in private homes without fear of police intervention.

Thus, while broad-based use of protective custody serves to sweep the public areas of town clear of intoxicated persons in possession of bottles, police response to private, at-home drinking is limited to requests for assistance. Protective custody laws do not provide for police intervention into private homes, although in some cases police will respond to these requests in Barrow. The net result of protective custody pick-ups is that the individual is jailed from 5-12 hours.

In Bethel, the dry policy has a similar affect of

causing citizens to purchase and consume bottles in private. The private domain is a haven for town residents and village residents with town relatives or acquaintances.

In short, state and town practice encourages private drinking from bottles obtained legally or illegally. The net result seems to be that serious violence that is alcohol related is more likely to occur at home, where fewer drinking controls exist.

Barrow and Bethel both employ the same dry local option that encourages drinking in the private sector. However, a comparison of Bethel region outpatient accidents to the Barrow data indicates that these two towns differ somewhat in accident trends. For Bethel, the percentage of all accidents that occur inside the home is 4% lower than the statewide ratio, and 14% lower than the Barrow ratio. Bethel alcohol-related accidents occurring inside the home indicate an average 9% lower than the Barrow average, but 5% higher than the statewide average. Similarly, in Bethel, the percentage of all injury purposefully inflicted by another, alcohol-related, that occur inside the home is 9% lower than the Barrow average, but 12% higher than the statewide average (Table 2).

Police practice in Bethel is similar to Barrow and yet different. Police confiscate open bottles in public and jail persons with bottles until civil fines are paid. Fines are usually paid immediately after confiscation of the

bottle, and individuals are rarely jailed on this town ordinance. Bethel police do not use protective custody frequently. Instead, police convey persons to the sleep-off center.

The high level of transports of Bethel citizens to the sleep-off center (29 percent of all town residents were transported at least once in 1977) suggests that residents may be more inclined to solicit police intervention when domestic drinking occurs and where the end result is transport to a sleep-off center and not incarceration of a loved one in the local jail.

Because protective custody replaced criminal law charges for being drunk in private as well as drunk in public, it has severely narrowed alcohol control practice where protective custody is the mainstay of alcohol control practice as it is in Barrow.

Bethel's use of a second resource, a sleep-off center, may be one way to provide a useful avenue for police intervention into private drinking situations at the request of town residents. The sleep-off center is a means of increasing drinking controls within the home by encouraging residents to solicit police intervention that does not have the end result of incarceration in the local jail.

The Village of Fishnet

An Introduction

We have chosen the name "Fishnet" to denote the key satellite village in our Barrow region study. Fishnet's location on the Arctic Ocean coast makes this one of Alaska's more remote communities. The lives of the people have long been tied to the subsistence resources of the surrounding region. However, recent events are severely impacting the traditional subsistence life-style and economy of the village. Most of the lands surrounding Fishnet are within National Petroleum Reserve - Alaska (NPR-A), where an extensive oil and gas drilling program is presently underway. Increased local employment opportunities offered by the North Slope Borough and the Village Corporation, plus the availability of new jobs in the region afforded by the construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline have resulted in rapid economic and social control changes within the village. Modest increases in local employment have come about as a result of the expansion of North Slope Borough facilities (through oil-related revenues), and investment revenues by the Village Corporation in the community. Many residents of Fishnet have become accustomed to traveling outside of the village for local government and pipeline jobs, while their families remain at home.

The Role of Alcohol in Fishnet

Serious crime in Fishnet is rare. Local law enforcement problems are mainly related to alcohol abuse. The first professional policeman for the village of Fishnet arrived early in 1978, and has found that about 90% of the serious incidents (excluding rescue and dog control) are alcohol related.

In the past, alcohol problems in Fishnet were dealt with extensively by the village council that served to confront and admonish offenders, and guide them back into respectable village life. Council records for the years 1940 through 1970 describe the approach of the council in admonishing alcohol offenders. The main concern of the council was the source of alcohol to the offender. The provider of the alcohol that precipitated the offender's behavior was the focus of council investigations. Although offenders were questioned about their actions while intoxicated, they were usually questioned more extensively about their source of liquor (See Appendix 1).

In the late 1970's, the Fishnet council approach to alcohol abuse problems has changed.

At a special council meeting in late 1977, Fishnet residents gathered to voice their concerns and personal encounters with alcohol related violence and harassment. The principal of the Fishnet school reported that every teachers' house had been robbed since the beginning of the year, and school vandalism had become a serious problem. Through the

principal, the school council presented specific resolutions to the Fishnet council: 1) The Barrow liquor store should be closed; 2) The North Slope Borough should provide Fishnet with 24-hour professional police protection; 3) The North Slope District Court should give maximum sentences to Fishnet alcohol offenders.

The focus of the remainder of the council meeting became a public demand for increased police protection from the North Slope Borough. The role of the council in the admonishment and rehabilitation of alcohol offenders was not discussed. The issue of alcohol offenders had become a police concern in the eyes of Fishnet residents.

In 1978, the Fishnet council continued to envision the alcohol abuse problem as a state-wide justice concern. In March of 1978, the council resolved to send a letter to the Code Revision Committee on Alaska Alcohol Statutes. The letter expressed their wishes that the sale of liquor to individuals-per-day be limited in rural Alaskan areas.

In April of 1978, the council composed a letter to the State District Attorney expressing the council's wish that the court system deal firmly when sentencing bootleggers.

We were able to do an analysis of the 1978 Fishnet village council records through August of that year. In this 8 month period, only one alcohol offender was directly confronted by the council. A young male who created a public disturbance while intoxicated was advised to "drink at home and not in public". He was not formally charged

with an offense "because of his drinking".

The Role of Other Drugs in Fishnet

We explored a theory often suggested in Alaska, that other drugs may have replaced alcohol in rural Alaska. We found little or nothing to support this in the context of rural drinking and alcohol control, through interviews with key village individuals.

The Fishnet village police officer reported that, although marijuana is readily available to them, most alcohol abuse still occurs among the young adult population. It is his opinion that young adults are also the citizens most successfully dealt with by the Village Council.

We conducted an interview with a 20-year-old village female who was of the opinion that alcohol was used in Fishnet almost exclusively by the "19-30-year-olds". Although an ounce of marijuana is available to this woman and her peers at the same cost as a bottle of bootleg whiskey (\$80.00), it is only the availability of liquor that warrants extended social gathering among her peers. Usually, the only drinking she sees in the village happens: "at the houses of young bachelors who have parties if alcohol comes in on charter flights". She further described parties among her peers as occurring only when alcohol is available, and lasting until the liquor is gone. Drinking that is done by older individuals in the village appears to shock this young village woman, and she feels that she will no longer drink when she grows older.

We also interviewed a 22-year-old male resident of Fishnet who was on his way to Fairbanks. He did not hesitate in describing his journey as being a "booze run" which he usually makes once a month. He planned to bring back a few cases of hard liquor to the village that he will use to throw a few parties, and later planned to defray the expense by selling "a few bottles at \$80.00 each" to his friends. He did not consider this to be an income source, but describes it as "a way to keep my friends happy". He considers his profession to be construction jobs when they are available.

While marijuana was readily available in villages we studied, alcohol was viewed as an avenue toward alternative behavior that was not symptomatic of other drugs. Alcohol was also perceived accurately as a scarce commodity to be consumed in its entirety while available.

Restrictive policies have contributed to the identification of alcohol as a relatively more precious, scarce commodity.

The Role of the Village Policeman

The Fishnet village policeman is employed by the North Slope Borough, and patterns his work around the requests of the village council. As viewed by the professional policeman for Fishnet in 1978, job performance is complex in order to meet the needs of villagers. The policeman must keep a low profile in the village, never actively look for quarrels where his intervention would be a hinderance (family arguments), and be always available for calls when a situation gets out-of-hand (Fishnet Village Policeman, 1978).

As drawn from our interview with Fishnet's first professional police officer, these are the major justice and alcohol concerns in the village:

1) A breakdown of police activity in Fishnet from 1/1/78 through 8/15/78 (See Table) was provided by the village police officer. When dog calls, search and rescue and medical emergencies are left out, 69% of all calls were alcohol related. When crimes considered to be serious by the police officer are considered by themselves, 91% of all calls were alcohol related. Further, out of the five suicide attempts listed in Table , four of them have been young women in an alcohol depression. Police calls for the restraint of disorderly drunk persons and bootleggers are usually limited to payday in the village.

2) In the opinion of the village police officer, bootlegging is not a serious problem in Fishnet. Every two weeks, when residents receive their paychecks, bootleggers visit the village. He estimates that bootleggers make \$6,500 a month from Fishnet's two paydays. It is unusual for Fishnet residents to mail order alcohol from Fairbanks, as is a common practice in Barrow. The police officer describes this hesitancy to mail order alcohol as being part of the village social consensus, and not a "lack of sophistication" on the part of Fishnet residents. An individual who obviously orders alcohol over a citizen's band radio, or the public telephone in Fishnet is subject to ostracization by many village residents. Alcohol usually arrives with charter flight

passengers in duffle bags or boxes that disguise the original liquor identification.

3) It is the contention of the village police officer that the alcohol problems are of a much greater magnitude in Fishnet during a wet year in Barrow. When the liquor store is open in Barrow, the discrete methods of bringing alcohol into Fishnet are simplified.

Some independent developments in Fishnet are changing the village-town relationship as it has been described in this report. In many suburban villages of Bethel, for example, most drinking behavior has switched from the village to the town. This shift from village to town is important, since villages lack elemental resources to deal with alcohol-related problems from a legal, treatment or medical perspective.

Possibly the greatest complexity inherent with the police role in Fishnet is patterning job performance around the needs of villagers, while, at the same time, satisfying the western-law-way expectations of the North Slope Borough. The Fishnet village police officer won the confidence and trust of villagers with subtle intervention practices and respect in family disputes. However, the North Slope Borough Department of Public Safety was critical of this same police officer's hesitancy to make arrests, especially in the case of a juvenile involved in an alcohol-related family dispute (Fishnet School Principal Interview, 1979).

In Fishnet, new housing, a new school, a new waterplant and other construction has generated short-term wage earning

opportunities in a labor scarce environment. This has obviated the need to migrate to the town (or elsewhere) to earn money.

With the emergence of wage earning opportunities, resident and non-resident bootleggers supply liquor as a scarce commodity to the village. The relationship between the town and village changes because the relevance of the town as a source of income and of liquor diminishes.

What occurs, then, is a transfer of liquor-related problems to the village on a scale in which they have historically occurred in the town. Villages, such as Fishnet, armed with scarce resources must then confront town alcohol problems.

Community Solutions to Alcohol Abuse

Preceding the local option elections in Barrow, common agreement is achieved among citizens that alcohol problems exist, but a consensus about the definition of a solution is illusive. Support for the desirability of the dry local option varies across years. However, the local option election is one response that the community can make to the problem, and it is an occasion for discussion of the issues and concerns.

In a study he performed on "Alcohol Problems in the Norton Sound Health Corporation Region, Dennis Kelso pinpoints community ambivalence about what the alcohol problems are, how bad they are, and who's responsibility it is to do anything (p. 11, Kelso, 1979). In this ambivalence, drinking and alcohol abuse are associated with Eskimo culture, as

inevitable, and defined as individual problems and thus unable to be influenced. Further, such drinking behavior is also linked with the economy and the weather--other factors that no one can control, and thus any ability to possibly deal with the problem is further reduced, if not made impossible. From this perspective, there is no direct action that can be taken.

Kelso recommends that the notion of community responsibility should be considered as an issue, and consciously accepted as an environmental manipulation in the solution of alcohol abuse (p. 15, Kelso, 1979).

Kelso basically defines "community responsibility" in terms of developing agency and community definitions of solutions to alcohol problems, i.e., absolute social control mechanisms should replace public ambivalence and tolerance to drinking behaviors. Also inherent in community responsibility is improved interagency communication networks, i.e., problem drinkers who encounter the criminal justice system should be identified for further medical and social service intervention.

Community solutions in a village such as Fishnet, within a paradigm described above, are ultimately dependent upon the decisions of agencies and citizens in Barrow. Justice and social concerns that serve Fishnet are geographically located in Barrow. A social consensus in Fishnet that advances public intolerance to drinking behaviors is faltering

without the reinforcement that can be provided by Barrow or statewide agencies.

Table 1

1978
NATIVE HEALTH SERVICE
ACCIDENTS TREATED ON AN OUTPATIENT BASIS

	TOTAL FIRST VISITS	OCCURRED INSIDE HOME
STATEWIDE: All Native Service Units		
Total All Accidents	15,827	2,751
Number of Alcohol Related Accidents	2,249	628
Total Accidents with Injury Purpose- fully Inflicted by Another	1,458	467
Number of Accidents with Injury Purposefully Inflicted that were Alcohol Related	858	305
<u>BARROW SERVICE UNIT: Servicing the Town and Surrounding Villages</u>		
Total All Accidents	1,471	391
Number of Alcohol Related Accidents	352	149
Total Accidents with Injury Purpose- fully Inflicted by Another	179	101
Number of Accidents with Injury Purposefully Inflicted that were Alcohol Related	141	81
<u>BETHEL SERVICE UNIT: Servicing the Town and Surrounding Villages</u>		
Total All Accidents	2,457	321
Number of Alcohol Related Accidents	251	82
Total Accidents with Injury Purpose- fully Inflicted by Another	162	74
Number of Accidents with Injury Purposefully Inflicted that were Alcohol Related	103	49

TABLE 2

1978
NATIVE HEALTH SERVICE
ACCIDENTS TREATED ON AN OUTPATIENT

	<u>STATEWIDE*</u>	<u>BARROW**</u>	<u>BETHEL**</u>
Percentage of all Accidents that were Alcohol Related	14%	24%	10%
Percentage of all Alcohol Related Accidents that were Injury Purposefully Inflicted by Another	38%	40%	41%
Percentage of All Accidents that Occur Inside the Home	17%	27%	13%
Alcohol Related Accidents that Occur Inside the Home	28%	42%	33%
Percentage of all Injury Purposefully Inflicted Accidents, Alcohol Related that Occur Inside the Home	36%	57%	48%
Percentage of all Purposefully Inflicted Accidents that Occur Inside the Home	32%	56%	46%

- * This represents the statewide native population which includes all Native Health Service Units, Urban and Rural
- ** This represents the service unit region which includes the town and surrounding villages

Table 3

1978
NATIVE HEALTH SERVICE
BARROW REGION SERVICE UNIT

OUTPATIENT ALCOHOL RELATED ACCIDENTS
CAUSE OF INJURY

CAUSE	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Injury Purposefully Inflicted by Another	129	40%
Accidental Falls	56	17
Motor Vehicle	48	15
Cutting and Piercing Instruments	33	10
Undetermined	18	6
Other	16	5
Animal Related, Not Stings	8	3
Suicide	6	2
Environmental Factors	4	1
Firearms	2	-
Machinery	2	-
Accidental Poisoning	1	-
Fires	<u>1</u>	-
TOTAL:	324	

(Data from Alaska Area Native Health Service, Systems Development)

Table 4

1978
NATIVE HEALTH SERVICE
BARROW REGION SERVICE UNIT

OUTPATIENT ALCOHOL RELATED ACCIDENTS
PLACE OF INJURY

PLACE	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Home, Inside	139	42%
Home, Outside	75	23
Highway and Street	43	13
Not Specified	23	7
Recreation and Sport	17	5
Public Building	15	5
Other	5	2
Industrial Premise	4	1
School	1	-
Resident Institution	1	-
Farm, Ranch	<u>1</u>	-

TOTAL: 324

(Data from Alaska Area Native Health Service, Systems Development)

Appendix 1. Fishnet Village Council Minutes

August 30, 1947

The Councils meeting held in schoolroom at 3:30 p.m. The meeting called by the President of the Council, P.P., and members of the councils were present. W.B., M.K., F.A., A.K., and K.R., and some of the members were absent. The purpose of this meeting and Andrew M. came in front of council. He says when he up to Alice K. house, he found out O.T., he brought some kind of bottle from Alice's warehouse, then Andrew went out to work and then after little while go up the house again he smelled coffee and alcohol. O. drank coffee and O. want Andrew drink coffee too but he didn't. And David B. brought in. He sayd he fill his cup with coffee and then O. he put something in David's cup. He say he smelled, he tasted, but he pour out. The boys drink straight coffee. Isaac A. and Jim A. and David B. he fill his cup again with straight coffee, and then after little while David's taste funny in his mouth, he says almost vomit while he work cause he taste that first cup with something in it. And Marshall go after O. but he come without O. But O. say he have to tell his parent first then he do not want to bother with councils. Parent must know first, if parent were advise first, then he can come to the councils.

September 4, 1947

The Councils meeting held in the schoolroom at 7:30 p.m.

The meeting called by the Vice President P.S. and members of the councils were present. W.B., M.K., F.A., W.N., K.R., and R.N., the councils they know something lately about O.T. Marshall go after O.T. Here O. talk now. He says they drink coffee with D.B., A.M. and Isaac. And he put alcohol in his own cup but he don't put rest of cup. So he taste too strong alcohol so he pour out his cup and he drank straight coffee. He don't drink coffee with alcohol since that time. But he don't bring any bottle from the warehouse. The boys talk whiskey while they drank coffee. That why he put alcohol in his own cup, and councils did not settle about that case cause witnesses are not here in town. So when these witnesses arrives in town they decided to meeting again, and another case about children when those Weasel arrive and go in the morning children ought to stay away from the Weasels. They also like to advise them do not bother with Weasels anymore. Mr. M. ought to advise children about that. They also decided curfew will be ring at 9 p.m. and if any children did not obey curfew they will haul gravel to fill empty drum first disobeys, children to be fill one half of drum and second disobeys to be fill one drum and third disobeyed to be fill one and one half drum.

Signed,

Vice President P.S.